Sno-Stilly Local Integrating Organization (LIO) Survey

Survey responses

Q1

Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements.

Answered: 14 Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The objectives of the LIO have been clearly communicated to me.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The role of the LIO Implementation Committee (IC) is well-defined.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The role of the LIO Executive Committee (EC) is well-defined.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Most of the topics covered in meetings are relevant to the stakeholders I represent.</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments (optional)

1. The objectives of the LIO have been clearly communicated to me.
2. The role of the LIO Implementation Committee (IC) is well-defined.
3. The role of the LIO Executive Committee (EC) is well-defined.
4. Most of the topics covered in meetings are relevant to the stakeholders I represent.
Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. I receive enough information on important topics to prepare me for meeting discussions.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. I feel that my participation in the LIO allows me to meaningfully contribute to ecosystem recovery efforts.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. The IC and EC adequately represent the stakeholder groups that need to be involved in the LIO.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>38.77%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4

If you somewhat or strongly disagreed with statement #7 above, which additional stakeholder group(s) do you think should be invited to participate in the LIO?

Answered: 3  Skipped: 11

All Federally-recognized Tribes with Reservations within the boundaries of an LIO’s geographical area should be represented on both the IC & the EC; this should be supported by all LIO partners and members (including PSP which uses Federal dollars to run its programs), and LIO members should not simply defer to former EC chairperson’s statement that, “it’s up to the Tribes to work that out,” essentially locking out the Tribe in question (Snoqualmie Indian Tribe).

2/17/2016 1:57 PM

Need to include more cities in the IC and EC. Right now, only Arlington and Stanwood participate. A separate meeting with city representatives to discuss the LIO objectives would be helpful.

2/16/2016 5:57 AM

In regards to #6 and #7 the LIO adds more meetings that take away from local coordination at a basin level with staff limited stakeholders that need the greatest levels of support to implement actions.

2/12/2016 9:15 AM
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Q5

The LIO committees meet:

Answered: 11  Skipped: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too frequently</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the right number...</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not often enough</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6

The time allotted for discussion during meetings has been:

Answered: 12  Skipped: 2

2/22/2016
Q7

The e-mails that I receive from LIO Support Staff are:

Answered: 13  Skipped: 1

Answer Choices
Too little  25.00%  3
About right  50.00%  6
More than necessary  25.00%  3
Total  12

Informative
Not all that informative
Longer than necessary

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Answer Choices
Informative  76.92%  10
Not all that informative  7.69%  1
Longer than necessary  15.38%  2
Total  13

Comments (2)

Q8

The LIO web page is: (check all that apply)

Answered: 13  Skipped: 1

Answer Choices

Informative
Not all that informative
Longer than necessary

https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-MBTMDQZQ/
Q9

What goals do you hope to achieve for the stakeholder group you represent by participating in the Snohomish-Stillaguamish LIO?

Answered: 9   Skipped: 5

Meaningful progress toward salmon recovery goals, e.g. getting on track with the 2005 Salmon Recovery Plan targets.
2/17/2016 1:59 PM

Coordination and interaction with partners, project funding
2/17/2016 10:43 AM

More participation/involvement from local governments
2/16/2016 5:59 AM

Provide funding for proposals (NTA's) that best help achieve the three Puget Sound Strategic Initiatives, and the objectives and focus on Snohomish-Stillaguamish LIO 5-Year Ecosystem Recovery Plan-First Elements priority vital signs for these watersheds.
2/12/2016 3:39 PM

Well integrated and coordinated projects that improve habitat and environmental conditions.
2/12/2016 10:34 AM

Get fast and robust support, either financial or legislative, for the action items we submit that are targeted for the recovery of Puget Sound.
2/12/2016 9:17 AM

Clearer, expedited route toward funding projects and accelerating progress towards PS recovery; less convoluted process for developing and vetting projects (e.g. the NTA instructions have been harder to read and understand than necessary; not all aspects of the process clear on how they contribute to evaluation).
2/17/2016 2:03 PM

I am not sure what "problem" the LIO process is solving. It seems to be a lot of extra work without a clearly defined reason. The extensiveness of the process puts a significant financial burden on our nonprofit since any time spent attending meetings and submitting NTAs is unfunded time. If I knew at the outset of this process how much time it would take that we do not have grant funding for our organization may have opted to not participate.
2/17/2016 10:47 AM

Additional discussions on the relationship of the LIO with the watershed groups, FxD, SLS, and the PSP's Action Agenda.
2/12/2016 10:35 AM

Q10

Do you have any suggestions for how the LIO could be more efficient and effective?

Answered: 7   Skipped: 7

Clearer, expedited route toward funding projects and accelerating progress towards PS recovery; less convoluted process for developing and vetting projects (e.g. the NTA instructions have been harder to read and understand than necessary; not all aspects of the process clear on how they contribute to evaluation).
2/17/2016 2:03 PM

I am not sure what "problem" the LIO process is solving. It seems to be a lot of extra work without a clearly defined reason. The extensiveness of the process puts a significant financial burden on our nonprofit since any time spent attending meetings and submitting NTAs is unfunded time. If I knew at the outset of this process how much time it would take that we do not have grant funding for our organization may have opted to not participate.
2/17/2016 10:47 AM

Additional discussions on the relationship of the LIO with the watershed groups, FxD, SLS, and the PSP's Action Agenda.
2/12/2016 10:35 AM

I think the work would be better coordinated at a Basin Level as our LIO is too large and diverse to work together as a community with common purpose. The reality is we only have one elected official that regularly participates, and that representative is from a City. Additional elected officials could provide direct benefit to their constituents.